



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,419	09/02/2004	Ole-Bendt Rasmussen	3339	8359

7590 05/30/2006

William J Daniel
6100 Woodland Terrace
McLean, VA 22101-4225

EXAMINER

O'HERN, BRENT T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/506,419

Applicant(s)

RASMUSSEN, OLE-BENDT

Examiner

Brent T. O'Hern

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 12-15, 18-24, 26, 27, 31, 34-38 and 53-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 12-15, 18-22, 53-60 and 65-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 34-38, 61-64 and 71-75 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (product claims) with respect to Groups I and II (method claims) and without traverse with respect to Groups I and III (apparatus claims) and Groups II and III in the reply filed on 21 April 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "there is a very close relationship between the product and method". This is not found persuasive because the product can be made by a materially different process as mentioned in the Office action dated 23 March 2006. The newly added product (65-70) and method claims (71-75) are deemed to belong to their respective groups, Groups I and II.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-22, 53-60 and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "**strongly bonded**" and "**is at most weak**" in claim 2, lines 3 and 6 are **relative terms** which renders the claim indefinite. The above terms are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the

Art Unit: 1772

scope of the invention. It is unclear what is meant by "strongly bonded" and "at most weak".

The phrase **"wherein the bonding strength in the strand-free remainder of said mutually contacting surfaces, determined in the same manner"** in claim 57, lines 1-3 is vague and indefinite. It is unclear where the "mutually contacting surfaces" is located and what the "same manner" is referring to.

The phrases **"the strands appear at least about 0.5 distant from the striations to impart a three-dimensional effect to the cross laminate"** in claim 58, lines 9-10 and **"said corrugations being of sufficient depth that the strands appear to be spaced internally of said corrugations a distance of at least about 0.5 mm"** in claim 68, lines 9-10 are vague and indefinite because it is unclear what "about 0.5 distant" and "corrugations a distance of at least about 0.5 mm" mean.

Claims 1-22, 53-60 and 65-70 are vague and indefinite since many of the claims, especially claims 1, 2, 12, 20 and 57 do not **positively set forth the limitations** of the claims. The claims should be rewritten using standard U.S. patent claim terminology including where appropriate a preamble and, positive limiting language such as "comprising", "wherein", "said", etc. Furthermore, where the claim sets forth a plurality of elements these elements should be separated by indented lines. (See *MPEP* 608.01(i) and 703.03(d)).

Clarification and/or correction is required.

Examiner's Note

3. Many of the claims are very difficult to follow. The applicant is advised to carefully review all claims and make amendments where necessary so as to be consistent with standard US patent claim terminology.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 10, 12-13, 19-20, 57 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Britton (US 4,454,184).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 13, 19-20, 57 and 66, Britton ('184) teaches a cross-laminate (*FIGs 4 and 8, cross laminates #11a and #12a*) comprising, at least one pair of two adjacent (*col. 6, ll. 23-26, multiple layers 3, 4, 5 and 6*), mutually bonded (*col. 3, l. 8 "spot welded" strands and col. 3, l. 17 "fused laminate"*),

separately coextruded films A and B (*FIG-8, separately extruded films (11a & 12a and 13a & 14a)*),

each of which has an unbalanced biaxial orientation (*FIGs 4 and 7, biaxial orientation*),

Art Unit: 1772

with the main direction of orientation in film A crossing the main direction of orientation in film B (*FIGs 4 and 1 wherein #11a, #12a, 313a and #14a cross each other*),

the films each comprises a continuous main layer (*FIG-4, continuous films of adhesive above and below strands*),

consisting of a polymer material selected to give high tensile strength, on at least their mutually facing sides of said main layers (*col. 2, ll. 42-47*),

a first surface layer of a different polymer material (*See col. 2, ll. 42-47, 1st polymer being the nylon polymer strands and the 2nd layer being the polymeric adhesive above/below the strands*), and

interposed between each first surface layer and its main layer a second surface layer (*FIG-1 and col. 2, ll. 49-58 adhesive above/below the strands*),

the first surface layer on the main layer of each of the films A and B being a discontinuous layer consisting of (*See Fig-1 where the strand are not a solid sheet thus not continuous in the direction between the strands and wherein the adhesive is not continuous between the strands*),

at least one array of coextruded thin strands (*See FIGs 4 and 1, multiple arrays of strands #11a and #12a*),

with the strands in the adjacent arrays of the two films arranged in crossing relation to one another (*FIGs 4 and 1 wherein the strands cross each other*), and

the second surface layer is continuous and formed of a polymer material (*col. 2, ll. 49-58 and FIG-1, the continuous polymeric PVC, rubber, etc. layers above and below the strands*).

The phrases **“the polymer material of at least one such array being selected to modify a property in the surface of the respective film which relates to the optical appearance of the laminate, or the bonding between the mutually facing sides of the main layers of the films A and B, or a combination thereof”** and **“selected to control the bonding between the strand-free facing regions of the main layers”** in claim 1, lines 12-15 and 16-17 are given little patentable weight since the applicant is introducing **use limitations** into product claims (see *MPEP 2173(q)*).

The phrase **“wherein the bonding strength at said points of intersection of the thin strands of said arrays, as measured by a peel test carried out on narrow specimens of the cross-laminate at a velocity of about 1 mm/cm, is at least 40 g/cm and the bonding strength in the strand-free regions, determined by a similar test, is at the highest 75% of the bonding strength between the strands at said points of intersection”** in claim 10, lines 1-6 is a **process limitation** in a product claim and hence given little patentable weight since patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see *MPEP § 2173.05(p)*).

The phrase **“which comprises on at least one of its outer films, an exterior surface layer adapted to enhance a surface property of the laminate selected from its heat-sealing capability or its frictional properties”** in claim 13, lines 1-3 is given

Art Unit: 1772

little patentable weight since the applicant is introducing **use limitations** into product claims (see *MPEP 2173(q)*).

The phrase **“to establish an at most weak bonding or a blocking between the contacting mutually facing sides' strand-free regions thereof”** in claim 19, lines 4-6 is given little patentable weight since the applicant is introducing **use limitations** into product claims (see *MPEP 2173(q)*).

The phrase **“a material selected to modify the optical appearance of the laminate”** in claim 66, lines 9-10 is given little patentable weight since the applicant is introducing **use limitations** into product claims (see *MPEP 2173(q)*).

Regarding claim 2, Britton ('184) teaches wherein the strands in the respective arrays are in contact with one another at their points of intersection and bonded (*col. 3, l. 8 “spot welded” strands and col. 3, l. 17 “fused laminate”*).

Regarding claim 12, Britton ('184) teaches wherein a cross-laminate comprising an assembly of a common film A having a main layer with a strand-formed first surface layer on both of its surfaces and two exterior films B each having a strand-formed first surface layer facing toward said common film B with the strands thereof bonded to the strands of said common film A (*see col. 6, ll. 23-26 and FIG-1 wherein an additional layer such A with a strand is placed on top of the laminate*).

Regarding claim 19, Britton ('184) teaches wherein each said second surface layer includes an adhesion modifying material (*col. 2, l. 54 and ll. 49-58*).

5. Claims 1-2, 10, 13-14, 18-20, 57, 66 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lappala (US 2,851,389).

Art Unit: 1772

Regarding claims 1, 10, 13, 19-20, 57 and 66, Lappala ('389) teaches a cross-laminate (*FIG-1, entire FIG*) comprising, at least one pair of two adjacent (*FIG-1, layers #2 and #3*), mutually bonded (*FIG-1, adhesive #4*), separately coextruded films A and B (*col. 2, ll. 4-10*), each of which has an uniaxial orientation (*FIGs 4 and 5 and col. 2, ll. 48-50 uniaxial orientation*),

with the main direction of orientation in film A crossing the main direction of orientation in film B (*FIG-1, wherein the top and bottom films cross each other*),

the films each comprises a continuous main layer (*FIG-1 and col. 2, ll. 66-68*), consisting of a polymer material selected to give high tensile strength, on at least their mutually facing sides of said main layers (*FIG-1 and col. 2, ll. 20-22, polymeric strands #1 and polymeric adhesive #4*),

a first surface layer of a different polymer material (*FIG-1, polymeric strands #1 and polymeric adhesive #4*), and

interposed between each first surface layer and its main layer a second surface layer (*FIG-1 surface layer of adhesive #4*),

the first surface layer on the main layer of each of the films A and B being a discontinuous layer consisting of (*See FIG-1, wherein the strands are not continuous between each group of strands.*),

at least one array of coextruded thin strands (*FIG-1, the multiple arrays of strands crossing each other*),

with the strands in the adjacent arrays of the two films arranged in crossing relation to one another (*FIG-1, wherein the strands cross each other*), and

the second surface layer is continuous and formed of a polymer material (*FIG-1 wherein the continuous adhesive layer is above/below the strands*).

Regarding claim 2, Lappala ('389) teaches wherein the strands in the respective arrays are in contact with one another at their points of intersection and bonded (See *FIG-1, col. 2, ll. 48-50 and col. 6, claim #2 wherein adhesive #4 bonds the other materials together.*).

Regarding claim 14, Lappala ('389) teaches wherein the main layer of each of the two films A and B consists essentially of polyethylene (*col. 2, l. 31 and ll. 66-67*).

Regarding claims 18 and 70, Lappala ('389) teaches a laminate when viewed in cross-section taken transversely of the thin strands exhibits a generally regular arrangement of ribs formed by corrugations imparted to the cross-laminate which are thicker than its average thickness (*See FIG-1 wherein corrugations are formed by strands #1 which create a corrugation that is clearly thicker than the areas without the strands*) and have a generally arcuate curvature (*See FIG-1 wherein the strands create arc-like shapes*).

The phrase **"in one direction perpendicular to its surface with the regions thereof adjacent to the rib boundaries being in the tensionless state bent in the opposite direction so that the regions between the boundaries of two adjacent ribs are of substantially reduced curvature compared to that of said ribs"** in claims

Art Unit: 1772

18 and 70 are given little patentable weight since the applicant is introducing **use limitations** into product claims (see *MPEP 2173(q)*).

Regarding claim 19, Lappala ('389) teaches wherein the second surface layer includes an adhesion modifying material (*FIG-1 and col. 3, ll. 55-71 adhesive #4*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-7, 21, 53-56, 58-59 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lappala (US 2,851,389).

Regarding claims 4 and 53, Lappala ('389) teaches the above laminate, however, does not expressly teach wherein the thickness of the strands in the first surface layer of each of the films A and B is not greater than 30%/10% of the thickness of the respective film. However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable diameter strand may be used (*See col. 2, l. 45, any suitable diameter can be used*), which clearly changes the films/laminate ratio. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select a strand with a diameter that provides the above thickness ratio as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

Regarding claims 5 and 54, Lappala ('389) does not expressly teach wherein the collective area of the strands in each of said first surface layers constitutes not more

Art Unit: 1772

than 60%/30% of the area of the respective film side. However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable diameter strand may be used (*See col. 2, l. 45, any suitable diameter can be used*), which clearly changes the above area ratio. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select a strand with a diameter that provides the above area ratio as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

Regarding claims 6 and 55, Lappala ('389) does not expressly teach wherein the thickness increase in each of the films A and B at the locations where the strands are present is at most 30%/10% of the film thickness in adjacent strand-free regions thereof. However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable diameter strand may be used (*See col. 2, l. 45, any suitable diameter can be used*), which clearly changes the thickness increase. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select a strand with a diameter that provides the above thickness increase as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

Regarding claims 7 and 56, Lappala ('389) does not expressly teach wherein the distance from the center-to-center of adjacent pairs of strands in each array is between 2 mm and 80/20 mm. However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable pattern may be used (*See col. 2, l. 49-51, any suitable pattern*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select a suitable pattern that provides the above separation as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

Regarding claims 21 and 59, Lappala ('389) does not expressly teach wherein the first surface layer on each of the films A and B occupies/(makes up) at the highest 15%/(5%) of the volume of the corresponding film. However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable diameter strand may be used (*See col. 2, l. 45, any suitable diameter can be used*), which clearly changes the volume. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to select a strand with a diameter that provides the above volume as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

7. Claims 3, 58 and 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lappala (US 2,851,389) (or Britton (US 4,454,184), with regards to claims 3, 67 and 69), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Johnston (US 3,340,128).

Regarding claims 3, 67 and 69 Lappala ('389) and Britton ('184) teach the laminate discussed above, however, fail to teach wherein the polymer material of the strands of at least one of the arrays has added thereto pigmentation to thereby modify the optical appearance (imparting a metallic luster or an iridescent effect) of the laminate.

However, Johnston ('128) teaches wherein the polymer material of the strands of at least one of the arrays has added thereto pigmentation to thereby modify the optical appearance (imparting a metallic luster or an iridescent effect) of the laminate (*col. 24, l. 58*) for the purpose of providing a decorative motif (*col. 24, ll. 59-60*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to provide strands with pigmentation as taught

Art Unit: 1772

by Johnston ('128) in order to provide a product as described above since Lappala ('389), Britton ('184) and Johnston ('128) are all directed to reinforced laminates.

Regarding claims 58 and 68, Lappala ('389) teaches a laminate having a thickness at the highest of about 0.3 mm (*col. 3, ll. 34-35 and col. 2, l. 45 wherein the films are less than 0.015 in (0.381 mm)*), a film A (film A or B) is situated at one of its surfaces (*FIG-3, #2*), the film A having its exterior surface corrugated to form a visible pattern of striations extending in one direction (*FIG-3, corrugations created by strands*) the main layer and said second surface layer of said film are substantially transparent to enable the coloured strands to be visible when the laminate is observed from the A-side (*col. 2, l. 7*), however, does not expressly teach a laminate with the spacing of said striations in the pattern being at the highest about 3 mm, the depth of the corrugations being sufficient that the strands impart a three-dimensional effect to the cross laminate and the polymer materials of the thin strands on the film A are coloured.

However, Lappala ('389) teaches that any suitable pattern (*See col. 2, l. 49-51, any suitable pattern*) and any suitable diameter strand may be used (*See col. 2, l. 45, any suitable diameter can be used*) to provide such a spacing and configuration as taught by Lappala ('389). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art the time of applicant's invention to provide such a spacing and configuration as taught by Lappala ('389) for the purpose of providing a laminate that is light and strong (*col. 1, ll. 25-28*).

Furthermore, Johnston ('128) teaches wherein the strands are coloured

Art Unit: 1772

(*col. 24, l. 58*) for the purpose of providing a decorative motif (*col. 24, ll. 59-60*), as discussed above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide a laminate with the above structural dimensions and color as taught by Lappala ('389) and Johnston ('128) in order to provide a product as described above.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lappala (US 2,851,389) (or Britton (US 4,454,184), as applied to claim 1, in view of Velazquez (US 5,614,297) and Cederblad et al. (US 6,204,207).

Lappala ('389) teaches the laminate as discussed above and wherein each of the films A and B of the main layer is selected from HDPE, LLDPE or a blend of the two (*col. 3, l. 10 and col. 2, ll. 66-68*), and the strands in the first surface layers of the films is selected from a polymer which consists essentially of a copolymer of ethylene (*col. 2, l. 32*), however, fails to teach wherein the continuous second surface layer is formed mainly of LLDPE in admixture with 5 - 25% of a copolymer of ethylene having a melting point or a melting range within the temperature range of 50 - 80 °C, the strands having a melting point or a melting range within the temperature range of 50 - 100 °C.

However, Velazquez ('297) teaches wherein the continuous second surface layer is formed mainly of LLDPE in admixture with 5 - 25% of a copolymer of ethylene having a melting point or a melting range within the temperature range of 50 - 80 °C (*col. 8, ll. 26-47 and col. 3, l. 46*) for the purpose of providing a film that can be laminated with one or more films (*col. 6, ll. 13-17*).

Furthermore, Cederblad ('207) teaches wherein the strands have a melting point or a melting range within the temperature range of 50 - 100 °C (*col. 12, l. 42 wherein the melting point is 67 °C /152 °F*) for the purpose of forming firm bonds (*col. 6, l. 63*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide a laminate with a surface layer of LLDPE and ethylene with the above melting point range and the above strands as taught by Velazquez ('297) and Cederblad ('207) to provide a laminate as described above.

9. Claims 22 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lappala (US 2,851,389) or Britton (US 4,454,184), as applied to claim 1, in view of Cederblad et al. (US 6,204,207).

Lappala ('389) and Britton ('184) teach the laminate discussed above, however, fail to teach wherein the average melting point of the polymer material which constitutes the strand-formed first layer of each of said films A and B is at least about 10 °C/20 °C lower than the average melting point of the polymer material which constitutes the main layer.

Howe ver, Cederblad ('207) teaches wherein the average melting point of the polymer material which constitutes the strand-formed first layer of each of the films A and B is at least about 10 °C/20 °C lower than the average melting point of the polymer material which constitutes the main layer (*col. 12, ll. 38-53*) for the purpose of providing firm and light bonds (*col. 6, ll. 60-67*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide strands with melting points below that of the films as taught by Cederblad ('207) in order to produce the laminate discussed above since Lappala ('389), Britton ('184) and Cederblad ('207) are all directed to reinforced laminates.

10. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lappala (US 2,851,389) or Britton (US 4,454,184), as applied to claim 1, in view of Bonke et al. (US 6,299,966).

Lappala ('389) and Britton ('184) teach the laminate discussed above, however, fail to teach wherein the adhesion modifying material consists essentially of low molecular weight polyisobutylene or atactic polypropylene.

However, Bonke ('966) teaches wherein the adhesion modifying material consists essentially of low molecular weight polyisobutylene (*col. 6, ll. 9-10*) for the purpose of adhering a variety of surfaces (*col. 6, ll. 1-4*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide polyisobutylene as an adhesive material as taught by Bonke ('966) in order to produce the laminate discussed above since Lappala ('389), Britton ('184) and Bonke ('966) are all directed to polymer laminates.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent T. O'Hern whose telephone number is (571) 272-0496. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BTO

Brent T O'Hern
Examiner
Art Unit 1772
May 12, 2006


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

1772

5/22/06